

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5-9, 12-14, and 16-18 are present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 14 are independent claims. In this Amendment, claims 2 and 10 are canceled.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6, 7, 8, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

### **§ 102(b) Rejection – Ackermann**

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,752,602 (Ackermann). Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 14. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the claims as amended.

The Office Action alleges that upper container rim 16 (shown in Fig. 1) of Ackermann teaches the claimed “flange-like engaging section.” The Office Action further alleges that bottom surface 11 teaches the claimed bottom section, end walls and side walls 12-15 teach the claimed frame, and column sections 21, stacking sections 31, teach the claimed positioning portion. In addition, the Office Action alleges that Ackermann’s bottom section includes a plurality of openings, as recited in claim 9.

Ackerman discloses a stackable configuration (Figs. 1, 9) in which stacking feet 32, provided for each stacking section 31 and forming a stacking shelf 33, support a similarly shaped upper container (see column 5, lines 51-64).

Applicant disagrees that Ackmann anticipates the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that rim 16 in Ackermann would not constitute an engaging section to be engaged by a carrying section, as claimed.

Applicant submits that Ackermann does not disclose a bottom section for mounting a display substrate, as claimed.

Applicant submits that Ackermann discloses a container with side walls configured such that subsections of the walls are at different heights and thicknesses. However, in the present invention, the frame projects to a level higher than a level of a top surface of the bottom section.

Furthermore, it is preferred that the substrate accommodating tray of the present invention be thin in order to achieve space efficiency when the glass substrates are mounted (specification at page 16, lines 4-8). In particular, a preferred width of the frame 12 is about 100mm in order to support the weight of the stacked substrate trays (specification at page 17, line 21, to page 18, line 3), while the height between the top surface of the bottom section 11 is only about 5mm, just enough to prevent the substrate 20 from contacting the tray above (specification at page 13, lines 10-12, and page 24, lines 15-19).

In contrast, the perishable food (e.g., grape) container of Ackermann requires relatively high walls, which ensure natural circulation of cooled air (Technical Field of Ackermann).

In order to clarify the substantial differences between the substrate accommodating tray and a food container, Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 14 to include the features in claims 1 and 10, respectively. In particular, claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended to recite, “wherein the frame is provided along a periphery of the bottom section and projects to a level higher than a level of a top surface of the bottom section, and the width of the frame is substantially larger than the height of the top surface of the frame above the top surface of the bottom section.”

Applicant submits that Ackermann fails to teach this claimed feature.

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Ackermann, Nakajima**

Claims 5 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ackermann in view of JP 236953 (Nakajima). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that Nakajima fails to make up for the deficiencies in Ackermann. At least for the reasons above for claims 1 and 9, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 5 and 12. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48,222  
Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant